

United States Patent and Trademark Office



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/813,493	03/30/2004	L. Reg Funk	64,617-013	4900
7590 01/30/2007 Adam B. Strauss			EXAMINER	
DYKEMA GOSSETT PLLC			WATSON, ROBERT C	
Suite 300 39577 Woodw	ard Avenue		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
Bloomfield Hi	lls, MI 48304	• .	3723	
SHORTENED STATUTOR	RY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVER	Y MODE
3 MONTHS		01/30/2007	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

•	Application No.	Applicant(s) FUNK ET AL.	
	10/813,493		
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	_
	Robert C. Watson	3723	
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	pears on the cover sheet with t	he correspondence address	
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DOWN THE MAILING DOWN THE MAILING DOWN THE MAILING DOWN THE METERS	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICA 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS , cause the application to become ABANI	FION. be timely filed from the mailing date of this communication. FONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	
Status			
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>05 Jac</u> 2a) This action is FINAL . 2b) This 3) Since this application is in condition for alloward closed in accordance with the practice under Expression in the practice of	action is non-final. nce except for formal matters		
Disposition of Claims		•	
4) ☐ Claim(s) 58-75 is/are pending in the application 4a) Of the above claim(s) 61,64 and 71-75 is/are 5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ☐ Claim(s) 58-60, 62-63, 65-70 is/are rejected. 7) ☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	re withdrawn from considerat	on.	
Application Papers			
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accomposed and applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct and the option of the contract of the option of the contract of the option of the	epted or b) objected to by drawing(s) be held in abeyance.	See 37 CFR 1.85(a). s objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).	
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119			
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority document 2. Certified copies of the priority document 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority application from the International Bureau	s have been received. s have been received in Appl rity documents have been red u (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	ication No eeived in this National Stage	
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list	of the certified copies not rec	eived.	
Attachment(s)			
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date		mary (PTO-413) ail Date nal Patent Application	

Application/Control Number: 10/813,493

Art Unit: 3723

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 58-60, 62-63, and 65-70 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Blatz (5,328,154)in view of Extine (4,108,412).

Blatz teaches the use of plural stackable planar bodies having projections on the upper surface and pockets on the lower surface for stacking the planar bodies in a manner to support and level a vehicle. The upper planar body lacks a removable vehicle wheel positional restraint.

Extine teaches the use of a vehicle wheel positioning restraint at Figure 2.

Element 34 is a fixed positioning restraint having a curvilinear ramp shaped obstruction on the upper surface at an end thereof. Extine also shows a removable obstruction 30.

The edge portion on the lower surface below the obstruction may be termed a heel.

To stack a vehicle positioning elements such as vehicle wheel positioning restraint 34 and an obstruction 30 of Extine on the Blatz upper surface would have been obvious for one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made in view of the disclosure of Extine. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do this in order to prevent the vehicle from overrunning the stacked wheel support when it is driven on the stacked wheel support. To shape the pockets on the lower surface of the positioning restraint to match the projections on the upper surface of the first planar member is considered to be an obvious extension of the broad teachings of Extine; ie.,

Application/Control Number: 10/813,493

Art Unit: 3723

for the elements to be removably stacked the shape of the projections and pockets must match. The choosen shape of the projections and pockets is no more than an obvious matter of design choice absent a showing of criticality for this feature. Also, since Extine teaches that obstruction 30 is removable then it would similarly obvious to make the positioning restraint 34 removable. This is no more than a duplication of the removable teaching already taught in Extine.

Claims 61, 64, and 71-75 are withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b) as being drawn to a nonelected species, there being no allowable generic or linking claim. Election was made **without** traverse in the reply filed on 9/29/05.

Applicant's remarks have been given careful consideration. However, with respect to claim 58, this claim merely recites three interfitting blocks that are vertically stacked. This is certainly not patentable. Three children's blocks stacked on each other would appear to read on this claim. Applicant's suggestion that this concept is patentable is found to be fanciful.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Robert C. Watson whose telephone number is 571 272-4498. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon. - Thurs., 5:30am - 4:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Joseph J. Hail III can be reached on 571 272-4485. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

rcw

ROBERT C. WATSON